



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

117 N. Y. Supp. 273; *Jerome v. New York Evening Journal* (1908) 124 App. Div. 372, 108 N. Y. Supp. 801 (libel of a public officer in his official capacity sufficiently important); *People v. McClellan* (1908) 124 App. Div. 664, 109 N. Y. Supp. 76 (action to determine the right to the mayoralty of New York City); *Industrial and General Trust Co. v. Tod* (1905, Sup. Ct.) 46 Misc. 492, 95 N. Y. Supp. 44 (action by holder of railway bonds for breach of an agreement to reorganize the railroad involved questions of sufficient intricacy). In Louisiana, jurymen selected from certain occupations or professions may be impanelled when the courts deem it advisable. *Golding v. Petit* (1875) 27 La. Ann. 86; *Kellogg v. Clinton* (1876) 28 La. Ann. 674; see *Bruce v. Beall* (1898) 100 Tenn. 573, 47 S. W. 204. A New York court once emphatically declared itself as opposed on general principles to special juries as involving new machinery and tending to prolong litigation without producing results commensurately satisfactory. *Ives v. Ranger* (1892) 65 Hun, 622, 20 N. Y. Supp. 32. In a day of attempted judicial reform it might be interesting to determine the relative value of the verdict of the special jury as contrasted with that of the ordinary jury.

KANSAS INDUSTRIAL COURT—CONSTITUTIONALITY NOT INVOLVED IN COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS.—The plaintiffs, officials of the United Mine workers of America, sued out from the Supreme Court of the United States two writs of error to the Supreme Court of Kansas to review two judgments affirming the action of a district court of Kansas in adjudging them guilty of contempt for disobeying orders entered pursuant to the provisions of the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations Act (Kansas Laws, 1920, ch. 29) on the ground that the act was unconstitutional. Held, that the writs should be dismissed. *Howat et al. v. State of Kansas* (1922, U. S.) 42 Sup. Ct. 277.

The plaintiffs did not deny the constitutionality of section II, empowering the Court of Industrial Relations to conduct investigations, and it was expressly provided by section 28 that any adjudication that any section or provision was invalid should not affect the validity of the rest of the act. *State v. Howat* (1920) 107 Kan. 423, 191 Pac. 585. It is clear that the plaintiffs could not question the validity of other provisions not involved in the proceeding. See *Arizona Employers' Liability Cases* (1919) 250 U. S. 400, 429, 39 Sup. Ct. 553, 559. And when a witness is summoned before a court of competent jurisdiction he cannot refuse to testify because he thinks the court has not jurisdiction of the subject matter. *Blair v. United States* (1919) 250 U. S. 273, 39 Sup. Ct. 468. Manifestly there was no federal question here. Although the defendants in the second case attacked the constitutionality of the act, the court refused to review its decision because the validity of the order committing the defendants for contempt did not at all depend upon the validity of the Act. *State v. Howat* (1921) 109 Kan. 376, 198 Pac. 686; COMMENTS (1921) 31 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 75. The court of first instance had jurisdiction of the case and power to issue the injunction without reference to the act. The injunction so issued could be questioned only by direct proceedings on appeal, and not collaterally in a proceeding for contempt. See *Gompers v. Bucks Stove & Range Co.* (1911) 221 U. S. 418, 450, 31 Sup. Ct. 492, 501. It is disappointing not to have the validity of this interesting legislation determined, but the writs of error were properly dismissed. For a discussion of the Court of Industrial Relations with the provisions of the act, see Vance, *Kansas Court of Industrial Relations and its Background* (1921) 30 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 456; see also (1921) 31 *ibid.* 206.

MORTGAGES—SUBROGATION—ADVANCEMENT OF MONEY FOR REDEMPTION.—The defendant X held land subject to a mortgage to A for \$1,500 and a subsequent mortgage to the plaintiff B for \$6,000. A contract to sell the land to the defendant